DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 373 FL 017 355

AUTHOR Benelli, Beatrice; And Others
TITLE The Use of Superordinate Terms in Different Discourse Contexts.
PUB DATE Sep 87
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Developmental Section of the British Psychological Society (York, England, September 11-14, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Age Differences; *Child Language; *Classification; Comprehension; *Determiners (Languages); Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; Language Acquisition; *Language Usage
IDENTIFIERS *Anaphora; *Referents (Linguistics)

ABSTRACT

Four different kinds of story were presented to children aged 4,7, and 10 years and to adults. In the stories, the relationship between basic-level referents mentioned in the first part of the story and the related superordinates mentioned in the second part was changed by means of different kinds of articles introducing the superordinates: anaphoric use of the definite article, in both singular (A) and plural (B) form, and an indefinite article, used either in narrative contexts where it could be interpreted anaphorically (C) or in its proper introductive function (D), which excluded identification between the referent denoted by the basic level term and that identified by the superordinate. It was predicted that the younger children would interpret the superordinates anaphorically even in the (D) story form because they do not master the meaning of categorical terms as such but tend to define them simply by listing specific categorical instances. Results supported the hypothesis. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293373

THE USE OF SUPERORDINATE TERMS IN DIFFERENT DISCOURSE CONTEXTS

Beatrice Benelli*

Giuliana Pinto*

Emanuela Rosina

* Dipartimento di Psicologia dello Sviluppo e della Socializzazione
Università di Padova (Italy)
Via Beato Pellegrino, 26 - 35137 PADOVA (Italy)

Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Developmental Section of the British Psychological Society, York, 11-14 September, 1987.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. Benelli

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL017355

USE OF SUPERORDINATE TERMS IN DIFFERENT DISCOURSE CONTEXTS

Beatrice Benelli*, Giuliana Pinto*, Emanuela Rosina.
Dipartimento di Psicologia dello Sviluppo e della Socializzazione*
Università di Padova, Italy.

This study was aimed at understanding how children use superordinate terms, depending on the discourse context in which these terms are located.Four different kinds of story were presented to children aged 4, 7, 10 years, and adults, in which the relationship between basic level referents and the related superordinates was changed, by means of different kinds of articles to introduce the superordinates: anaphoric use of definite articles - both in singular and plural form - accomplishing coreferentiality between basic level referents mentioned in the first part of the story and superordinates mentioned in the second part.; indefinite articles used in narrative contexts which made coreferentiality acceptable and highly probable; the proper introductive use of indefinite articles, that is, a use which excludes the identification of the superordinate with the previously mentioned basic level referent. In this case, therefore, the superordinate term is to be interpreted in its general categorical meaning, that is, as expressing abstract classification criteria and potentially referring to any category referents. We predicted that even younger would repeat and understand superordinates correctly whenever coreferentiality was allowed, but misinterpret the superordinates with the introductory indefinite article, as denoting the basic level term mentioned in the first part of the story. This is because young children do not master the meaning of categorical terms as such , but tend to define them simply by listing specific categorical instances. Results supported the hypothesis.

ABSTRACT

Four different kinds of story were presented to children aged 4, 7, 10 years, and adults, in which the relationship between basic level referents mentioned in the first part of the story, and the related superordinates mentioned in the second, was changed by means of different kinds of articles introducing the superordinates: anaphoric use of definite article - both in singular (A) and plural form (B), and indefinite article, used either in narrative contexts where it could be interpreted anaphorically (C) or in its proper introductive function (D) which excluded identification between the referent denoted by the basic level term and that denoted by the superordinate. We predicted that younger children would interpret the superordinates anaphorically even in D stories. This is because they do not master the meaning of categorical terms as such , that is as expressing abstract general criteria, but tend to define them simply by listing specific categorical instances. Results supported the hypothesis.

INTRODUCTION

Different techniques have been used to study the development of conceptual and semantic organization in children, that is, how they form systems of concepts related to each other by means of coordinate, superordinate and subordinate relationships. Actually, one of the most intensively studied issue refers to how children understand that different basic level categories may be grouped together to form higher order classes of objects.

Some of these studies are based on extensional-denotative techniques, that is, on the child's capacity of choosing the appropriate referents of natural categorical terms among a wide range of possible alternatives (Saltz, Soller and Siegel, 1972) or generating categorical instances to a superordinate label provided by the experimenter (Nelson, 1974). These results are consistent with the position that children's category boundaries broaden with age. Another main result of tasks using object grouping and /or naming is that children possess or can be taught a taxonomic organization of concepts but this is not their most spontaneous and favourite way of organizing knowledge. Instead, below the approximate age of six children prefer a thematic/complementary way of classifying objects (Smiley and Brown, 1979; Markman and Hutchinson, 1984).

There are some problems, however, even in using controlled extensional tests of how children apply their words, with regard to drawing conclusions about the intensional criteria of such words. This means that it may be difficult or even misleading to infer the meaning children attribute to words, on the basis of the referents to which they extend these words. The most striking evidence for this point

comes from Anglin (1977) who found that some discrepancies may exist between the classification of categorical instances, and the definition children had provided of the related categorical terms: while definitions were usually adequate although skeletal (e.g. food = to eat), referential choices were often made according to criteria which had nothing in common with those mentioned in the definitions (e.g. lollypops are not chosen as a kind of food).

Actually, another widespread technique requires children to provide verbal definitions either of basic level names or of the superordinate themselves (Nelson, 1978; Anglin, 1977; 1985). As regards basic level terms, the common result of such studies is that younger children simply describe the sensory properties of objects (mostly functional, but also perceptual and contextual), while older children's definitions also mention the superordinate categorical membership of objects). (For a review see Bjorklund, 1985 or Anglin, 1985). As regards superordinates, the usual finding is that younger children are not able to explain the abstract and complex criteria which characterize higher order categories, but tend to define superordinates by listing the most familiar categorical instances or by giving simple functional definitions. (Nelson, 1978; Anglin, 1985).

Even using definitions as a means of investigating children's conceptual/semantic knowledge is not free from limitations, the main of which is that children seem to know about objects much more than they reveal in this kind of task. This is because capacity of giving good definitions, that accomplish both formal and content requirements, is a kind of metalinguistic knowledge (Wehren, De Lisi and Arnold, 1981; Watson, 1985; Benelli, in press) which bypass the child's knowledge of the to-be-defined objects. Discrepancy between the knowledge children

actually possess and that part of it they express in definitions is shown by the interview method : when asked more detailed questions on the objects' nature, even very young children reveal a rather complex knowledge of the defining properties of objects, categorical membership included (Anglin, 1985).

To summarize, in spite of the great variability in methods, which may lead even to contradictory results on the actual structure of the child's semantic organization, some general trends may be sketched: I) children are able to organize concepts taxonomically; however this becomes a consistent and permanent way of organizing object knowledge only during school years. II) They are able either to find the most typical instances of superordinate category or to give adequate descriptions of the defining basic level criteria. They are even able to understand the simplest criteria defining higher order categories. II) What seems difficult to them is linking all these dimensions into complete, informative, conventionally shared conceptual representation, where the general categorical membership of objects is stated by means of superordinate labels and their individual identity is defined by means of their typical basic level properties.

AIM OF THE PRESENT CONTRIBUTION

This study is aimed at understanding how children use superordinate terms, depending on the different discourse and narrative contexts in which these terms are located. The reason for this is that - according to us - information on the child's semantic organization may derive not only from tasks focused on the actual extension, definition, retrieval, recognition, etc. of categorical terms, but also from situations where

Such terms are placed in broader, perhaps more familiar contexts. By this we mean situations in which the correct understanding of superordinate terms is aimed at performing some other task, such as reaching some playful goal, solving problems or repeating stories.

In this study we presented children with some stories they had to repeat to the experimenter, so that repetition could be used as a means of inferring the meaning children attributed to the superordinates presented in the stories. We believe that if children are allowed in experimental tasks to use rules and strategies deriving from their usual interactive/communicative experience, this, on one hand, would make the task itself more significant to the child and, on the other, give us more realistic information on the child's organization of conceptual and semantic knowledge.

The main standpoint is that, although the inclusion relationship between basic-level and superordinate word meaning is invariant, their relationship in linguistic usage varies as a function of the speaker's communicative purposes and possible intended referents (Olson, 1970). For example, if we are to pinpoint a dog among alternative examples like cats and horses, an instruction such as "look at the animal" would be communicatively inadequate, and the basic term would be the only good one in order to reach the target ; on the contrary if the alternatives are cars and pieces of furniture, then the superordinate too would be sufficient to reach the communicative goal.

STUDY ONE

METHOD

The issue of article usage . In Study One, four different kinds of story were presented to children at different age levels and adults, in which the intended relationship between basic level terms and the related superordinates was changed by using different kinds of articles preceeding the superordinates, that is, definite and indefinite articles. It is well known that definite articles are used anaphorically, i.e. in order to refer to some already mentioned subject, while indefinite articles are used with an introductory function, that is, to introduce a new subject. However, this distinction is not absolute, in that, in actual communicative interactions, both kinds of article may change their usual function, according to the discourse context in which they are used; for example, definite articles may be used as introductory when they are higly determined by the described situation, while indefinite articles may be interpreted anaphorically, when the context makes identification with a previously denoted referent highly probable. The study of Zehler and Brewer (1982) provides a detailed analysis of all the possible functions of articles - distinguishing between the linguistic-grammatical article distinction and their actual, context frame usage. They showed that there is an initial phase where only indefinite article is used, followed by a phase of correct use of definite article too, and a third phase in which definite article is overused. However, this overuse may be interpreted as the child's attempt to adjust the basic article distinction to the communicative contexts where articles are used.

Stimulus Material . Following these considerations, four kinds of story were devised, the general meaning of which was manipulated, by using some of the above described article functions.

In the first kind of story (A), the definite article was used in its typical anaphoric function, that is, a referent - first denoted by its basic level term - was denoted in the second part of the story by the related superordinate, introduced by "the" (e.g. a daisy.....the flower).

In the second kind of story (B) the same anaphoric use of the definite article was applied to several basic-level referents which were later referred to by the related superordinate term in plural form (e.g. a daisy, a violet and a rose.....the flowers). Therefore, in both cases the narrative context implied coreferentiality between the referents of the first and second part of the story.

In the third kind of story (C) the superordinate term was introduced by the indefinite article (a daisy....a flower) but the content of the story allowed the listener to interpret it, again, as coreferential to the the previously specified referent.

In the fourth kind of story (D) the indefinite article was used in its proper introductory function, that is, to introduce a new referent, which therefore could not be identified with that mentioned in the first part of the story. There is, obviously, a fifth possible kind of story, which presents the indefinite article in plural form. We have not used it, in that, in Italian, introducing several, new referents requires a peculiar kind of article which expresses a part/whole relationship (roughly equivalent to the English term "some"). This, requiring complex cognitive abilities - such as quantification of inclusion - might interfere with the analysis of the traditional liguistic-communicative distinction between the different functions of articles. Examples of the stories are shown in Table 1.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

Subjects . Forty children aged 4.1 through 5.0 (mean age = 4.8), 40 children aged 6.10 through 7.6 (mean age 7.5), 40 children aged from 10.3 to 11.0 (mean age = 10.9) and 40 adults were read the stories and asked to repeat them, in order to check how they would reproduce the superordinate terms. All subjects lived in a medium-sized town in northern Italy. At each age level, four independent groups of 10 subjects were randomly formed, but with an equal number of boys and girls, and each group was presented with only one kind of story.

Procedure . For each kind of story, four different stories were provided, by randomly varying presentation order. Subjects, orally and individually tested, were told they had to listen carefully to the story because they had to repeat it as well as they could. However they were not asked to repeat them verbatim and no special emphasis was put on the superordinates. After repetition, some control questions were asked in order to assess wether identification of the superordinates with the already mentioned basic level terms had taken place on the A, B and C stories, but not on the D stories.

All children had been previously submitted to a pre-test aimed at assessing wether they knew the anaphoric/introductive distinction, that is, they used it in their spontaneous speech. Therefore, they were presented with two sequences of pictures - representing simple events - they had to describe. We controlled for the kind of article children would use the first time they encountered the main character of the sequence (indefinite article) and when they encountered it again in the following pictures (definite article). All subjects passed the pretest, that is, even the youngest children showed to be able to use this rule, thus confirming Emslie and Stevenson's (1981) data on early correct distinction between definite and indefinite use of articles on

spontaneous descriptions of events.

Hypothesis . We predicted that, in the first three kinds of story (A, B, and C, where coreferentiality was legal) subjects at all age levels would understand the stories correctly, even though they would repeat the basic-level term instead of the superordinate, given the greater psychological significance of the former (Rosch, 1978). The only exception to the preference for basic level terms was expected to involve superordinates in plural form, in that they accomplish both a cognitive and narrative synthesis of the several referents.

As regards the stories of the fourth kind (D) predictions differ according to age level: we expected that younger children (4 and 7-year-olds) would have more difficulties in repeating and understanding superordinates correctly. This is because in this case no coreferentiality is allowed between basic and superordinate terms and the latter are to be interpreted as such , that is, in their general categorical meaning, referring to any other unspecified members of the category. Our predictions on younger children's poorer performances stem from the literature on conceptual development, which showed that young children are not able to deal with abstract defining criteria of higher-order categories, and tend to define superordinate terms simply by listing specific category instances (Nelson, 1978; Anglin, 1977, 1985). Therefore, we expected that, even in the stories where coreferentiality was not possible, younger children would identify the superordinates with the referents provided in the first part of the story.

RESULTS

The distribution of correct and non correct repetitions of the superordinates at the different age levels is shown in Table 2.

(Insert table 2 about here)

Let us first consider the three kinds of story where coreferentiality is allowed by the articles and by the text (A - B - C). In all these cases, Correct answer means that subjects repeated the superordinates correctly and, on the control questions, confirmed their identification with the previously mentioned basic referents. In the Non-Correct category, those repetitions were considered which either substituted the basic term for the superordinate or added the former to the latter. Thus, although comprehension was adequate, repetition was not faithful.

In the stories where coreferentiality was not legal (D) Correct answers are those in which subjects repeated the superordinate term faithfully and, on the control questions, denied the possibility of identifying it with the basic level term: when asked about the identity of the superordinate, either they said they couldn't know it ("because you did not tell me") or they provided another basic level name (" maybe, it was a tulip") or they simply acknowledged its unspecified nature ("it could be anyone"). Another strategy revealing that subjects had understood that coreferentiality was not allowed by article and context was repetition of the superordinate preceeded by the adjective "another" (e.g.,". ...another flower").

In A stories, data show that - at all age levels - there is a greater proportion of non correct repetition of the story, in that both children and adults prefer using basic level terms instead of superordinates. (The difference of Correct and Non Correct answers in the two groups of younger children <u>vs.</u> older children and adults,

calculated by means of a X square (1 d.o.f.) was not significant). This confirms Rosch's interpretation of basic level concepts having a greater psychological significance and higher use frequency than any other level of the taxonomic scale. Since in this kind of story basic level terms reach the same communicative function as superordinates (that is, tranmitting the same correct interpretation of the story) but are semantically more significant, this may account for the subjects' spontaneous neglect of more literal reproductions of the stories.

In B stories (where superordinates are used in plural form to refer to more than one referent introduced in the first part of the story) subjects - at all age levels - prefer repeating the superordinates instead of listing the different basic level examples again. (No significant differences were found as a function of age, with a 1 d.o.f. X square). This means that preference for basic level terms is not absolute, but is affected by the narrative context where they are used, both in younger and in older subjects. In this kind of story, repeating all the basic level referents is antieconomic, from either a cognitive or a narrative point of view. Therefore, all subjects stuck to the literal version of the story by repeating the superordinates in plural form, which afforded an effective conceptual and communicative synthesis of the intended referents.

As regards C stories, where the indefinite article is used in contexts that make coreferentiality possible, the same considerations may be drawn than in the first kind of story. Again, preference for basic level terms, when their use instead of supererordinates accomplishes the same communicative purposes, is shown - with no significant differences between the four age groups.

Results on D stories are quite different, in that there is a

significant age-related difference in the distribution of Correct vs. Non Correct answers: X sqare (1d.o.f.) = 12.25, P < .001. Even though there is a greater tendency for all subjects to repeat and understand the superordinate term correctly (that is, as introducing a new, unspecified categorical member), in this kind of story younger children (4 and 7-year-olds) gave many more wrong answers than 10-year-olds and adults. They repeated the superordinates literally but, on the control questions, it became clear that they had identified them with the previously introduced basic level referents. Younger subjects, therefore, seem to have difficulties in acknowledging that superordinates introduced by indefinite articles signal a topic shift, and tend to refer them coreferentially even at the expenses of a sensible interpretation of the story itself.

Such errors are quite surprising if we consider that these subjects at the pretest had been shown to possess the introductive function of indefinite articles. Our interpretation is that this rule, which works at the basic level even in young children, may be somehow rendered useless by its combination with a superordinate term. This combination - when the context excludes anaphorical interpretations - compells subjects to accede the semantic core of superordinate terms and activate a general categorical representation. If we consider that younger children are not able to master the defining criteria of higher order categories, as such , but tend to incorporate them into precise basic level referents, it is not surprising that they produced a rather high number of misinterpretations of superordinates and stories. The rather shallow semantic organization of younger children prevents them from accepting the "double indeterminateness" of the combination of indefinite article plus superordinate terms, where the actual source

of indeterminateness are the superordinates. This interpretation is supported by a simple "post-hoc" verification, consisting in telling the same younger children a new story where another basic level member was used instead the superordinate. In this case, 100% of answers registered the change of the subject, that is, children repeated the new referent correctly. Further support comes from the study by Zehler and Brewer (1982), which showed (with basic level words) that even chidren as young as 3 have a rather sophisticated sensitivity to the context constraints on article usage. They mostly use the definite article - like adults do - even when grammatical accounts would predict the indefinite one but shared world knowledge and conversational postulates take precedence. If such a developed knowledge is no longer displayed with superordinates, this may be really attributed to the peculiar relationship between different hierarchical level concepts.

STUDY TWO

Study Two was aimed at answering to some question that may arise from the first one, as far as D stories are concerned. Our interpretation relies on the assumption that purely semantic factors are responsible for younger children's poorer performances and that children fully master the various communicative rules underlying text comprehension. More precisely, it could be pointed out that the source of children's difficulties was not in their lacking semantic organization but in their poor capacity to properly follow discourse-narrative rules. Their anaphorical interpretation of the indefinite superordinate mighth be due to a more general conservative tendency to dwell on an already given frame of reference, instead of going ahead in processing new

information. This strategy, which makes listeners search for prior discourse shared with speakers in communicative exchanges, is called by Clark and Haviland (1977) the antecedent maxim and has been proved to be typical of younger children in referential communication tasks (e.g. Jakson and Jacobs,1982). Young children are less prone to register thematic changes and are less aware of the open nature and possible ambiguity of the provided information (e.g. Robinson, 1981). As far as our stories are concerned, since basic level terms were always introduced first and superordinates later, the latter mighth have been obscured, to some degree, by the preminent position of the basic level term, in those texts which actually required a non-conservative processing strategy.

In order to disambiguate these interpretations of our data, a different kind of task was used also involving short stories, where the textual position was balanced between basic and superordinate terms, so that their role in the story could be attributed only to their different semantic value.

METHOD

Twelve subjects for each of the same age levels of the first study (mean aged = 4.5; 7.8; 11, and adults, equally devided by sex) were individually told two short stories, followed by an open question couched in terms of a forced choice between two terms. Two conditions were devised: Condition I, where choice was between basic terms and the related superordinates; Condition II, where choice was between two basic level members of the same general category.Subjects were randomly assigned to one or the other condition, with 6 subjects per Condition.

In Condition I, stories were as follows: I) "One day a boy went into his room, in order to take a toy and a little car from his box. In doing this he noticed that one of them was broken. Which one do you think was broken?". II) "One day a man went to the Zoo to take some pictures. In a cage he saw an animal and a tiger, but he coud take only one picture. Of which one do you think he took the picture?". Half subjects received the stories with basic terms and superordinates in the above presented order, the other half received them in the opposite order.

There are four possible answers to the open questions: 1) "I don't know", or "I cant decide" answers; 2) random choices; 3) choices of superordinates; 4) choices of basic level referents. This latter is expected to be the most frequent choice criterion, since at all age levels basic level concepts have a greater psychological significance than those higher in the taxonomy.

This is not true if the two terms have the same informative/semantic power. In the control group (Condition II), subjects were presented with the same stories, involving two equally familiar basic level referents. They were lion and tiger for Animals, and car and train, for Toys, and their order too was changed across subjects. In this case only random and "I don't know" choices were expected, in that there is no semantic imbalance between the two basic level names.

RESULTS

Results are shown in Table 3.

(Insert Table 3 about here)

As expected, the great majority of answers - in the

basic/superordinate condition - refer to basic level referents which are definitely preferred to superordinates. Only in the adult group "I don't know" answers were found, which reveal their greater metacognitive awareness as compared to all the other age levels. The two younger age levels are characterized by a peculiar strategy. This consists in spontaneously replacing the generic categorical term with basic level referents, which had never been mentioned in the story. Such data are consistent with the interpretation put forward in the previous study, which stressed younger children's incapacity to deal with superordinate names when they are to be interpreted in their abstract categorical meaning, and their need for instantiating them into concrete, individual referents.

The result pattern is quite different in the basic/basic condition. Again adults show higher metacognitive understanding of the fact that no predetermined answer is possible, but some answers of this kind are present even in the children groups: since no semantic bias is contained in either term, children seem more able to understand the open nature of the possible answers. Random choices were also highly frequent from the age of 7 onward, while 4-year olds were clearly affected by the recency effect : they tended to choose the basic term which was told last.

Taken together, the two conditions show that if there is an equal semantic value in the two alternative terms, then subjects follow no precise strategies or - at the youngest ages - may display a task-dependent behaviour. On the contrary, if one of the two alternatives has a more significant meaning, this affects subjects' strategies and even younger children reveal consistent, cognitive dependent choice criteria. By this we mean their attempt to "make

sense" of a semantically shallow word meaning by representing it in terms of familiar, well defined examples.

CONCLUSION

This contribution showed that studying the use of superordinate terms in different discourse contexts may provide useful information both on the child's semantic organization per se , and on the way in which other factors, such as knowledge of article functions and narrative contexts, interact with it.

As regards the first point, our data confirm previous literature on the child's conceptual/semantic development, in that they showed younger children's difficulty in fully handling categorical defining criteria.

As regards the second point, children were shown to possess the linguistic and communicative rules of articles when applied to basic level concepts, but to use them less efficiently as soon as these rules are to be applied to more complex conceptual knowledge. When this is well established, the familiar semantic and pragmatic rules may lead subjects to appropriate performances, while when semantic knowledge is still rather vague, even familiar rule such as the anaphoric/introductory distinction may be disrupted. It was also shown that the typical preference for the basic level terms, which is presumed by Rosch (1978) to be the most significant one from a cognitive point of view, is true when the use of the related superordinates actually neither decreases nor increases communicative efficiency. On the contrary, when using superordinates affords an efficient and more economic communication, this conceptual level

reveals a greater psychological relevance.

TABLE 1

EXAMPLES OF THE FOUR KINDS OF STORY

A) Once upon a time, a girl was walking in a haunted garden when she saw a beautyful daisy . She moved forward to pick it up but she slipped and, upon falling, crushed the flower . Immediately , she heard a thin voice saying: "Stand up, stand up! You are hurting me!". The girl stood up quickly and went away.

Questions: "Which flower did she crush?". "Do you remember how I told you?". "Could it be that she crushed another flower?".

B) Once upon a time, a girl was walking in a garden when she saw a daisy, a violet and a primrose . They were so beautyful that the girl wanted to pick them up. In moving forward she slipped and, upon falling, crushed the flowers . The girl felt very sad when she was going home.

Questions: "Which flowers did she crush?". "Do you remember how I told you?". "Could it be that she crushed other flowers?".

C) Once upon a time, a girl was walking in a beatyful garden when she saw a lovely daisy . She decided to pick it up, then she went back home and said to her mother: "Mummy, I have brought you a flower !".

Questions: "Which flower did she bring to her mother?". "Do you remember how I told you?". "Could it be that she brought her another flower?".

D) Once upon a time, a girl was walking in a haunted garden when she saw a lovely daisy . She wanted to pick it up but in moving forward she slipped, and upon falling crushed a flower . Immediately she heard a thin voice saying: "Stand up, stand up! You are hurting me!". Quickly the girl stood up and went away.

Questions: "Which flower did she crush?". "Do you remember how I told you?". "Could it be that she crushed the daisy?".

TABLE 2

Distribution of Correct and Non Correct Answers in Story Repetition

	A Stories			B Stories			C Stories			D Stories		
	C	NC	NA	C	NC	NA	C	NC	NA	C	NC	NA
4 Years	13	25	2	28	11	1	11	25	2	24	16	/
	31	47		60	18		29	45		51	27	
7 Years	18	22	/	32	7	1	18	20	1	27	11	2
10 Years	8	32	/	31	9	/	10	29	/	33	7	/
	21	59		58	22		22	61		71	9	
Adults	13	27	/	27	13	/	12	32	/	38	2	/
ToT.	52	106	2	118	40	2	51	106	3	122	36	2
	160			160			160			160		

TABLE THREE

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICE CRITERIA IN THE TWO CONDITIONS

	Condition I (Basic/Superordinate)		Condition II (Basic/Basic)	
4 Years	16	Mentioned Basic.	7	Basic mentioned first
	7	Not mentioned Basic.	14	Basic mentioned last
	1	Superordinate	3	"I don't know"
	0	"I don't know"	-	
	Tot. = 24		Tot. = 24	
7 Years	19	Mentioned Basic	11	Basic mentioned first
	3	Not mentioned Basic	13	Basic mentioned last
	2	Superordinates	0	" I don't know"
	0	"I don't know"	-	
	Tot. = 24		Tot. = 24	
11 Years	18	Mentioned Basic	9	Basic mentioned first
	0	Not mentioned Basic	13	Basic mentioned last
	6	Superordinates	2	"I don't know"
	0	"I don't know"	-	
	Tot. = 24		Tot. = 24	
Adults	11	Mentioned Basic	9	Basic mentioned first
	0	Not mentioned Basic	7	Basic mentioned last
	4	Superordinates	8	"I don't know"
	9	"I don't know"	-	
	Tot. = 24		Tot. = 24	

REFERENCES

ANGLIN,J.M. (1977) Word, object, and conceptual development , New York, Norton.

ANGLIN,J.M. (1985) The child's expressible knowledge of word concepts: What preschoolers can say about the meaning of some nouns and verbs. In K.E.Nelson (Ed.) Children's language , Vol. V, Hillsdale, N.J., LEA.

BENELLI,B. (in press) On the linguistic origin of superordinate categorization. Human Development .

BJORKLUND,D.F. (1985) The role of conceptual knowledge in the development of organization in children's memory. In C.J.Brainerd and M.Pressley (Eds.) Basic processes in memory development . New York, Springer.

CLARK,H.H.,HAVILAND,S.E. (1977) Comprehension and the given-new contract. In R.O.Freedle (Ed.) Discourse production and comprehension , Norwood, N.J., Ablex.

EMSLIE,H.C.,STEVENSON,R.J. (1981) Pre-school children's use of the articles in definite and indefinite referring expressions. Journal of Child Language , 8, 313-328.

JAKSON,S.,JACOBS,S. (1982) Ambiguity and implicature in children's discourse comprehension. Journal of Child Language , 9, 209-216.

MARKMAN,E.,HUTCHINSON,J.E. (1984) Children's sensitivity to constraints on word meaning: taxonomic versus thematic relations. Cognitive Psychology , 16, 1-27.

NELSON,K. (1974) Variations in children's concepts by age and category. Child Development , 45, 577-584.

NELSON,K. (1978) Semantic development and the development of semantic memory. In K.E.Nelson (Ed.) Children's language , Vol.I, New York, Gardner Press.

OLSON,D.R. (1970) Language and thought: aspects of a cognitive theory of semantics. Psychological Review , 4, 257-273.

ROBINSON,E.J. (1981) The child's understanding of inadequate messages and communication failure: A problem of ignorance or egocentrism? In W.P.Dickson Children's oral communication skills . New York, Academic Press.

ROSCH,E. (1978) Principles of categorization. In E.Rosch and B.Lloyd (Eds.) Cognition and categorization , Hillsdale, N.J., LEA.

SALTZ,E.,SOLLER,E.,SIGEL,I.E. (1972) The development of natural language concepts. Child Development , 43, 1191-1202.

SMILEY,S.S.,BROWN,A.L. (1979) Conceptual preference for thematic or taxonomic relations: A nonmonotonic age trend from preschool to old

age. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology , 28, 249-257.

WATSON,R. (1985) Towards a theory of definition. Journal of Child Language , 12, 181-197.

WEHREN,A.,DE LISI,R.,ARNOLD,M. (1981) The development of noun definition. Journal of Child Language , 8, 1, 165-175.

ZEHLER,A.M.,BREWER,W.F. (1982) Sequence of principles in article system use: an examination of a , the , and null acquisition. Child Development , 53, 1268-1274.